arXiv:1509.08530v1 [quant-ph] 28 Sep 2015

Analytical solvability of the two-axis countertwisting spin squeezing Hamiltonian

M. Bhattacharya
School of Physics and Astronomy, Rochester Institute of Technology,
84 Lomb Memorial Drive, Rochester, NY 14623, USA
(Dated: September 30, 2015)

There is currently much interest in the two-axis countertwisting spin squeezing Hamiltonian suggested originally by Kitagawa and Ueda, since it is useful for interferometry and metrology. No analytical solution valid for arbitrary spin values seems to be available. In this article we systematically consider the issue of the analytical solvability of this Hamiltonian for various specific spin values. We show that the spin squeezing dynamics can be considered to be analytically solved for angular momentum values upto 21/2, i.e. for 21 spin half particles. We also identify the properties of the system responsible for yielding analytic solutions for much higher spin values than based on naive expectations. Our work is relevant for analytic characterization of squeezing experiments with low spin values, and semi-analytic modeling of higher values of spins.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Dv, 42.50.Lc,32.60.+i

I. INTRODUCTION

The two-axis countertwisting spin-squeezing Hamiltonian ($\hbar = 1$)

$$H_{TA} = \frac{\chi}{2i}\left(J_+^2 - J_-^2\right), \tag{1}$$

was originally proposed by Kitagawa and Ueda [1, 2]. In Eq. (1) $J_\pm$ are the angular momentum raising and lowering operators [3], $i = \sqrt{-1}$ and χ is a constant. The quantity J may refer to a real angular momentum or a pseudospin $J = N/2$ representing the collective squeezing of N spin half systems [4]. The Hamiltonian H_{TA} yields maximal squeezing, with a squeezing angle independent of system size or evolution time. Experimental implementation has not yet been achieved, while a number of theoretical proposals have been put forward [6–12].

A general analytic solution to the Hamiltonian for arbitrary angular momentum does not seem to be available [13, 14]. Solutions to the dynamics for low values of spin are of interest to experiments with trapped ions [15] and quantum magnets [16], for example. In Ref. [4] a bound of spin 3/2 was stated as the maximum angular momentum value for which analytic solutions can be found. We presume this was based on the fact that the Hamiltonian matrix in that case is of dimension $2\times3/2+1 = 4$, leading to a characteristic polynomial of quartic order, which is the highest degree for which algebraic solutions can generally be found [5]. In Ref. [13] the existence of analytical solutions (with the additional presence of an external field) up to spin 10 was reported and explicit expressions were provided for spin 1. No explanation was given of the unexpected fact that solutions for spins much larger than 3/2 were found, nor was the maximum value of spin for which analytical solutions could be found supplied.

In the present article we systematically analyze the question of analytical solvability of the two-axis countertwisting spin squeezing Hamiltonian of Eq. (1). We extend the bound for solvability to spin 21/2, i.e. 21 spin half particles (we note that in Ref. [13] spin 10 corresponds to 10 spin half particles). We point out that critical roles in the solvability of the model for large spin values are played by the chiral symmetry and sparsity of the Hamiltonian matrix. Our approach requires only the use of matrix representations of the angular momentum operators and the evaluation the time evolution operator [17]. Our results may be useful for experiments with small number of spins.

II. SOME PROPERTIES OF H_{TA}

In this section we go over some properties of the Hamiltonian H_{TA} of Eq. (1) which are relevant to the discussion of analytical solvability. First, it can be seen readily by using

$$J_+ = J_-^\dagger, \tag{2}$$

that H_{TA} is Hermitian, implying that its eigenvalues are real.

Further, by using

$$J_\pm = J_x \pm iJ_y, \tag{3}$$

we can rewrite

$$H_{TA} = \chi\left(J_xJ_y + J_yJ_x\right). \tag{4}$$

Now let us consider a rotation by the angle π about the J_y axis. This rotation leaves J_y unaffected, but reverses the sign of J_x, i.e.

$$e^{-i\pi J_y} H_{TA} e^{i\pi J_y} = -H_{TA}, \tag{5}$$

which can be written as the anticommutation relation

$$\{H_{TA}, e^{i\pi J_y}\} = 0. \tag{6}$$

This relation implies that $e^{i\pi J_y}$ is a chiral symmetry of H_{TA} [18]. In practical terms, the implication of the anticommutation is that eigenvalues of H_{TA} occur as signed pairs $\pm\lambda_1, \pm\lambda_2, \ldots$ (A brief proof is provided in the Appendix for the reader's convenience). Therefore if H_{TA} can be represented by an even dimensional matrix, then the characteristic polynomial of H_{TA}

$$P(\lambda) = |H_{TA} - \lambda I| = 0, \tag{7}$$

is even in λ, where I is the unit matrix of the same dimension as H_{TA}. If instead H_{TA} is of odd dimension, then its characteristic polynomial is λ times a polynomial even in λ. In this case there is necessarily a zero eigenvalue, and all other eigenvalues are signed pairs. Specific examples will be given below. As will be verified with these examples, the property of chiral symmetry contributes to giving a simple form to the characteristic polynomials for even large spins, and making them analytically solvable. For completeness we note that the Hamiltonian considered by the authors of Ref. [13]

$$H_f = H_{TA} + \Omega J_z, \tag{8}$$

where Ω represents an external field along the z axis, also possesses the chiral symmetry indicated above. This partly explains the solvability of the squeezing model H_f analytically for up to spin 10.

Finally, by using the matrix elements in the basis $|j, m\rangle$ where J_z is diagonal

$$\langle j, m'|J_\pm|j, m\rangle = \sqrt{j(j+1) - m(m' \pm 1)}, \tag{9}$$

it can be readily verified that H_{TA} is a rather sparse matrix, i.e. most of its elements are zero. This feature also contributes to simplifying the form of the characteristic polynomial.

III. THE TIME EVOLUTION OPERATOR

We now consider the time evolution operator

$$U_{TA} = e^{-iH_{TA}t}. \tag{10}$$

Since U_{TA} determines the spin dynamics completely, the model is analytically solvable if a matrix representation for U_{TA} can be found, with all entries determined analytically. A straightforward way to implement this is to diagonalize H_{TA}. If the eigenvalues of H_{TA} can be found analytically, the diagonal and analytic form of U_{TA} follows. However, the calculation of expectation values then requires the relevant initial state to be rotated by the unitary matrix that diagonalizes H_{TA}. As these matrices can be quite cumbersome and require the determination and careful handling of the eigenvectors of H_{TA}, we follow instead an equivalent procedure that only deals with the eigenvalues of H_{TA}, but avoids referring to its eigenvectors.

Our approach is to expand the right hand side of Eq. (10) in a Taylor series. The termination of that series is actually guaranteed since H_{TA} is a finite dimensional matrix. This guarantee comes from the Cayley-Hamilton theorem, which states that every square matrix satisfies its own characteristic equation, which in turn implies that any power of the H_{TA} can be expressed in terms of the matrix powers $(H_{TA})^0, (H_{TA})^1, \ldots, (H_{TA})^{2J}$, where J is the associated spin. The entries of the terminating matrix representation of U_{TA}, it turns out, can be written as functions of the eigenvalues of H_{TA} [17], see below. Therefore, if the eigenvalues can be calculated analytically, then the spin dynamics can be found exactly.

For reference, we quote the explicit expression for U_{TA} in the case where H_{TA} possesses nondegenerate eigenvalues $\lambda_k, k = 1, 2, \ldots$ (the degenerate case can be handled via some straightforward modifications) [17])

$$U_{TA} = \sum_{k=1}^{2j+1} e^{-i\lambda_k t} \prod_{\substack{n=1 \\ n\neq k}}^{2j+1} \left(\frac{H_{TA} - \lambda_n}{\lambda_k - \lambda_n} \right). \tag{11}$$

IV. RESULTS

A. Solvability

In Table 1. we show for various spins the characteristic polynomial $P(\lambda)$ of H_{AT}. We make some comments on the entries in this table. For $J = 1/2$, the eigenvalues are both zero, and it can be verified that

$$H_{TA}(J = 1/2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{12}$$

consistent with the observation, first made by Kitagawa and Ueda, that a single spin half particle cannot be squeezed [2].

Generally for half-integer spin, $P(\lambda)$ is even in λ and some of the eigenvalues are degenerate. In Table 1, we have indicated which spin values lead to degeneracy in the eigenvalues of H_{TA}, so that the appropriate procedure may be used for obtaining U_{TA}. Generally, if any factor in the characteristic polynomial repeats, then there is degeneracy in the energy spectrum. To make this identification rigorous, we have calculated the discriminant of $P(\lambda)$, which returns a zero value if degeneracy is

present. The combination of chiral symmetry and matrix sparseness leads to rather compact expressions for the spin half-integer $P(\lambda)$'s. Indeed it is remarkable that $P(\lambda)$ for $J = 21/2$ fits on a single line. For integer spin, $P(\lambda)$ is a polynomial even in λ, times a single factor of λ. There seems to be no degeneracy in general and the polynomials are less compact in form than in the half-integer spin case.

Upto $J = 9/2$ it is evident that the roots of the polynomials can be found analytically, since the factors are of degree 4 or less, and solvability by radicals is guaranteed by the Abel-Ruffini theorem [5]. While spins 5 to 13/2 have factors sextic in λ, since these polynomials are even in λ, they can be thought of as being cubics in λ^2, which can be solved analytically. The same reasoning applies to the octic factors in the polynomials for spins 7 to 17/2. Finally, spin 9 to 21/2 contain factors of degree 10, which can be considered as being polynomials of degree 5 in λ^2. While the roots of such factors cannot be found algebraically, they can be stated in terms of hypergeometric functions [19]. However, for $J = 11$, there is a factor of degree 12 in λ (i.e. of degree 6 in λ^2). While the roots of polynomials of degree 6 and higher can be found in terms of modular functions (for example), they involve transcendental functions, and we will consider them not to be of closed form and therefore analytically unsolvable [20]. We note that for $J > 21/2$ the polynomial roots can be found numerically and inserted in Eq. (11), thus yielding a semianalytic solution for any spin value.

B. Spin squeezing

To compactly illustrate our results, we present the details for $J = 2$ (4 spin half particles), a case for which there seem to be no explicit results in the literature. In this instance, the matrix representations are given by

$$J_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{6} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{6} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{13}$$

$J_- = J_+^\dagger$, and

$$H_{TA} = i\chi \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{6} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 & 0 \\ \sqrt{6} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{6} \\ 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{6} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{14}$$

The eigenvalues of H_{TA} can be read off from Table 1. as $0, \pm 3, \pm 2\sqrt{3}$. The eigenvectors are $(-1, 0, i\sqrt{2}, 0, 1)/2$, $(-1, 0, -i\sqrt{2}, 0, 1)/2$, $(0, i, 0, 1, 0)/\sqrt{2}$, $(0, -i, 0, 1, 0)/\sqrt{2}$, and $(1, 0, 0, 0, 1)/\sqrt{2}$ in no specific order. The time evolution operator is

$$U_{TA} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2(\sqrt{3}\chi t) & 0 & -\sin(2\sqrt{3}\chi t)/2 & 0 & \sin^2(\sqrt{3}\chi t) \\ 0 & \cos(3\chi t) & 0 & -\sin(3\chi t) & 0 \\ \sin(2\sqrt{3}\chi t)/2 & 0 & \cos(2\sqrt{3}\chi t) & 0 & -\sin(2\sqrt{3}\chi t)/2 \\ 0 & \sin(3\chi t) & 0 & \cos(3\chi t) & 0 \\ \sin^2(\sqrt{3}\chi t) & 0 & \sin(2\sqrt{3}\chi t)/2 & 0 & \cos^2(\sqrt{3}\chi t) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{15}$$

The time evolution of any operator $\mathcal{O}$ is given by $\mathcal{O}(t) = U_{TA}^{-1}\mathcal{O}U_{TA}$. Using this relation we can find the time-evolved quantities $J_y(t), J_y^2(t)$, etc., and variances such as

$$(\Delta J_{y,}(t))^2 = \langle J_{y,}^2(t)\rangle - \langle J_y(t)\rangle^2, \tag{16}$$

etc. Starting from the initial state

$$|i\rangle = e^{i\pi J_y/2}\,|j = 2, m = 2\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\,|\frac{1}{2}, 1, \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}, 1, \frac{1}{2}\rangle\,, \tag{17}$$

i.e. the stretched state along z rotated by 90° about the y axis [2], we find the squeezing parameters following Wineland et al. [21, 22]

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_y &= \sqrt{4}\frac{\langle(\Delta J_y(t))\rangle}{|\langle J_x(t)\rangle|}, \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2}(17 - 6\cos 6\chi t - 6\cos 2\sqrt{3}\chi t + 3\cos 4\sqrt{3}\chi t)^{1/2}}{\left|\cos 3\chi t(1 + 3\cos 2\sqrt{3}\chi t) + \sqrt{3}\sin 3\chi t \sin 2\sqrt{3}\chi t\right|}, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

and

TABLE I: Characteristic Polynomials of H_{TA}/χ

J	$P(\lambda)$	Degenerate
1/2	λ^2	Yes
1	$\lambda(1-\lambda^2)$	No
3/2	$(\lambda^2-3)^2$	Yes
2	$-\lambda(\lambda^2-3)(\lambda^2-12)$	No
5/2	$\lambda^2(\lambda^2-28)^2$	Yes
3	$-\lambda(\lambda^2-60)(\lambda^2-6\lambda-15)(\lambda^2+6\lambda-15)$	No
7/2	$(\lambda^4-126\lambda^2+945)^2$	Yes
4	$-\lambda(\lambda^2-28)(\lambda^2-208)$ $\times(\lambda^2+10\lambda-63)(\lambda^2-10\lambda-63)$	No
9/2	$\lambda^2(\lambda^4-396\lambda^2+19008)^2$	Yes
5	$-\lambda(\lambda^2-108)(\lambda^2-528)$ $\times(\lambda^6-651\lambda^4+65619\lambda^2-455625)$	No
11/2	$(\lambda^6-1001\lambda^4+172315\lambda^2-2338875)^2$	Yes
6	$-\lambda(\lambda^2-336)(\lambda^4-1176\lambda^2+55440)$ $\times(\lambda^6-1491\lambda^4+421155\lambda^2-12006225)$	No
13/2	$\lambda^2(\lambda^6-2184\lambda^4+1012752\lambda^2-74794752)^2$	Yes
7	$-\lambda(\lambda^2-784)(\lambda^4-2296\lambda^2+353808)$ $\times(\lambda^8-3108\lambda^6+2236710\lambda^4-328692196\lambda^2+3773030625)$	No
15/2	$(\lambda^8-4284\lambda^6+4488102\lambda^4-1062230652\lambda^2+22347950625)^2$	Yes
8	$-\lambda(\lambda^4+6624\lambda^2+1900800)(\lambda^4+16704\lambda^2+28753920)$ $\times(\lambda^8+23184\lambda^6+138054240\lambda^4+204233529600\lambda^2+33886369440000)^2$	No
17/2	$\lambda^2(\lambda^8-7752\lambda^6+16263696\lambda^4-9531032320\lambda^2+995361177600)^2$	Yes
9	$-\lambda(\lambda^4-7056\lambda^2+6441984)(\lambda^4-3096\lambda^2+668304)$ $\times(\lambda^{10}-10197\lambda^8+29403594\lambda^6-25878927978\lambda^4+5213177173701\lambda^2-88322873900625)$	No
19/2	$(\lambda^{10}-13167\lambda^8+50640282\lambda^6-62764022286\lambda^4+19627235976789\lambda^2-584689432201875)^2$	Yes
10	$-\lambda(\lambda^4-5456\lambda^2+3165184)(\lambda^6-11396\lambda^4+20438704\lambda^2-2031480000)$ $\times(\lambda^{10}-16797\lambda^8+84869994\lambda^6-145160193178\lambda^4+68747106284901\lambda^2-3870591128105625)$	No
21/2	$\lambda^2(\lambda^{10}-21252\lambda^8+140008176\lambda^6-329460868800\lambda^4+241815611520000\lambda^2-33685691719680000)^2$	Yes
11	$-\lambda(\lambda^4-8976\lambda^2+10644480)(\lambda^6-17556\lambda^4+55226160\lambda^2-15437822400)$ $\times(\lambda^{12}-26598\lambda^{10}+225185103\lambda^8-712278892116\lambda^6$ $+768687668037135\lambda^4-2024208595453621502\lambda^2+4712996874211250625)$	No

$$\xi_z = \sqrt{4}\frac{\langle(\Delta J_z(t))\rangle}{|\langle J_x(t)\rangle|}, = \frac{2[7-3\cos 4\sqrt{3}\chi t-(\sin 6\chi t+\sqrt{3}\sin 2\sqrt{3}\chi t)^2]^{1/2}}{\left|\cos 3\chi t(1+3\cos 2\sqrt{3}\chi t)+\sqrt{3}\sin 3\chi t\sin 2\sqrt{3}\chi t\right|}. \quad (19)$$

Squeezing occurs when the squeezing parameter is less than 1. The parameter ξ_y is plotted versus time in Fig. 1. There is no squeezing in the y quadrature for the duration shown. The parameter ξ_z is plotted in Fig. 2. Squeezing in the z quadrature can be seen for two short intervals in the diagram.

For completeness we mention that correlations between the various spin components, which are relevant to squeezing [4], can also be found analytically for this solvable model. For example, plotted in Fig. 3 is the



FIG. 1: (Color online) The squeezing parameter ξ_y [Eq. (18)] as a function of the dimensionless time χt for $J = 2$.



FIG. 2: (Color online) The squeezing parameter ξ_z [Eq. (19)] as a function of the dimensionless time χt for $J = 2$.



FIG. 3: (Color online) The correlation $\langle J_xJ_z+J_zJ_x\rangle$ [Eq. (20)] as a function of the dimensionless time χt for $J = 2$.

quantity

$$\begin{aligned}\langle J_xJ_z + J_zJ_x\rangle &= \frac{3}{2}\cos\sqrt{3}\chi t \\ &\times\left[\left(1-\sqrt{3}\right)\sin\left(3-\sqrt{3}\right)\chi t\right. \\ &\left.+\left(1+\sqrt{3}\right)\sin\left(3+\sqrt{3}\right)\chi t\right]. \quad (20)\end{aligned}$$

V. CONCLUSION

We have shown that the two-axis counter-twisting spin squeezing Hamiltonian can be solved analytically for up to angular momentum 21/2. We have discussed the properties of the Hamiltonian that lead to such a high degree of solvability. From our results the axis of optimum squeezing can be found readily. Our methods can also be used to find useful quantities such as entanglement measures, in closed form. Future work will investigate the effects of decoherence on the solutions. We would like to thank K. Hazzard for stimulating discussions.

VI. APPENDIX

In this Appendix we show that the anticommutation of Eq.(6) implies the pairing of eigenvalues of H_{TA}. Consider an eigenvector ψ_+ of H_{TA} with an eigenvalue λ, i.e.

$$H_{TA}\psi_+ = \lambda\psi_+, \quad (21)$$

Multiplying from the left by $e^{i\pi J_y}$ and using the anticommutation of Eq. (6), we find the left-hand side of Eq. (21) reads

$$e^{i\pi J_y}H_{TA}\psi_+ = -H_{TA}e^{i\pi J_y}\psi_+, \quad (22)$$

while the right-hand side reads

$$e^{i\pi J_y}(\lambda\psi_+) = \lambda(e^{i\pi J_y}\psi_+). \quad (23)$$

Equating the right hand sides of Eqs. (22) and (23), we arrive at

$$H_{TA}(e^{i\pi J_y}\psi_+) = -\lambda(e^{i\pi J_y}\psi_+), \quad (24)$$

which implies that

$$\psi_- = e^{i\pi J_y}\psi_+, \quad (25)$$

is an eigenfunction of H_{TA} with an eigenvalue of $-\lambda$. Thus the anticommutation of the operator $e^{i\pi J_y}$ with H_{TA} leads to the $\pm\lambda$ pairing of eigenvalues in the spectrum of H_{TA}.

[1] M. Kitagawa and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1852 (1991).
[2] M. Kitagawa and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 5138 (1993).
[3] J. J. Sakurai, *Modern Quantum Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley, United States, 2010).
[4] J. Ma, X. Wang, C. P. Sun and F. Nori, Phys. Rep. **509**, 89 (2011).
[5] I. Stewart, *Galois Theory* (Chapman and Hall, United Kingdom, 2000).
[6] D. W. Berry and B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 012313 (2002).
[7] Y. C. Liu, Z. F. Xu, G. R. Jin and L. You, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 013601 (2011).
[8] E. Yukawa, G. J. Milburn, C. A. Holmes, M. Ueda and K. Nemoto, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 062132 (2014).
[9] T. Opatrny, arXiv:1409.0683v1 (2014).
[10] W. Huang, Y. L. Zhang, C. L. Zou, X. B. Zou and G. C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 043642 (2015).
[11] T. Opatrny, M. Kolar and K. K. Das, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 053612 (2015).
[12] C. Li, J. Fan, L. Yu, G. Chen, T. C. Zhang and S. Jia, arXiv:1502.00470v1 (2015).
[13] M. Jafarpour and A. Akhound, Phys. Lett. A **372**, 2374 (2008).
[14] P. K. Pathak, R. N. Deb, N. Nayak and B. Dutta-Roy, J. Phys. A **41**, 145302 (2008).
[15] V. Meyer, M. A. Rowe, D. Kielpinski, C. A. Sackett, W. M. Itano, C. Monroe and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5870 (2001).
[16] G. Tóth, C. Knapp, O. Gühne and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 042334 (2009).
[17] F. De Zela, Symmetry, **6**, 329 (2014).
[18] M. Bhattacharya and M. Kleinert, Eur. J. Phys. **35**, 025007 (2014).
[19] R. B. King and E. R. Cranfield, J. Math. Phys. **32**, 823 (1991).
[20] J. P. Boyd, *Solving Transcendental Equations* (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, United States, 2014).
[21] D. J. Wineland, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, F. L. Moore and D. J. Heinzen, Phys. Rev. A **46**, R6797 (1992).
[22] D. J. Wineland, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano and D. J. Heinzen, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 67 (1994).